Vol. XI, No. 16 HUMAN EVENTS April 21, 1954

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA APR 26 1954 LIBRARY

GOOD AND BAD AGGRESSORS

By CHESLY MANLY

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES and Henry Cabot Lodge, United States representatives to the United Nations, are protesting too much and proving too much with their arguments against admitting Communist China to the UN. If Britain and France agree at Geneva to support the seating of Chinese Communist delegates, the United States cannot keep them out, and both Dulles and Lodge know this. Their reiterated assurances have the hollow sound of an advance alibi, designed to evade charges of complicity when Red China is ensconced in the UN.

Logically and morally it is preposterous for Dulles and Lodge to oppose the admission of Communist China without demanding the expulsion of Soviet Russia. Any conceivable reason for excluding the Peiping regime, a creature and satellite of Soviet imperialism, is an argument *a fortiori* for expelling Communist Russia, the master aggressor.

On March 29, Dulles remarked that membership in the UN, by its Charter, is supposed to be limited to "peace loving" states; and he recalled that Communist China was a convicted aggressor in the Korean war. But the master aggressor in Korea was the Soviet Union. Even Dean Acheson recognized this fact when he told the UN Political Committee, on October 24, 1952, that the North Korean aggressor forces were "raised, heavily equipped and tactically and strategically advised by the Soviet Union government". Lodge told the same committee on February 25, 1953, that "Soviet planning instigated the original aggression, which was subsequently maintained by Soviet training and equipment". Although all members were under a UN injunction to refrain from giving assistance to the aggressors, Moscow's Andrei Vishinsky boasted that his government was supplying the Chinese Communists.

For once in the history of the UN, Americans had a right to be proud of their spokesman there when Dulles, on November 22, 1950, denounced a demand by the Anglo-Indian appeasement bloc to bury Nationalist China's request for an investigation of Soviet aggression against China. The appeasers, arguing that the China question was "academic", wanted the UN to look the other way. Dulles declared that China was "being subjected to aggression cloaked by fraud". With emotion and surprising eloquence, he maintained that those who sought to bury the question did so not because it was academic, but rather

Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because it was *not* academic, because they were afraid of offending a so-called Great Power. He warned them that the UN could not survive with a double standard of right and wrong, one for great powers and one for small or weak nations.

NOW DULLES AND LODGE appear to have a double standard of right and wrong, one for Communist China, a convicted aggressor, and one for Communist Russia, the master aggressor. When asked by a reporter why the UN did not condemn the Soviet Union for its part in the Korean aggression, Lodge replied: "It does no good to call names unless you are prepared to go to war."

Both Dulles and Lodge repulse all suggestions that the UN should take action against the Soviet government under Article 6 of the Charter, which states that any member "which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the organization . . .". The Soviet Union, having a veto in the Security Council, could not be expelled without its consent, but the other members could withdraw and reorganize without the Communists.

According to Lodge, it is essential to keep the Soviet Union and its satellites in the UN "so we can watch them and see what they are up to". But this is an argument for the admission of Communist China, which Lodge opposes. The Communists were boycotting the UN, because of Red China's exclusion, when the Korean aggression began; but not even Lodge has suggested that the Kremlin's representatives, had they been present, would have given the United States advance notice of the impending attack.

In an interview published by *Newsweek*, October 12, 1953, Lodge declared: "If war came in spite of the UN, it would then be the indispensable instrument for repelling the aggression — which is probably one reason why the Communists don't leave it." This is a curious statement. One may assume that the Communists are not staying in to help the UN repel their next aggression. Therefore, according to Lodge's view, they must be staying in to sabotage efforts to make the UN an effective instrument for repelling aggression. If that is so, why not kick them out?

Lodge knows, of course, that the UN, far from being an effective instrument for repelling aggression in Korea, impeded efforts by the American military commanders to conquer the aggressors. He also knows that the UN cannot repel aggression in the next war. The State Department, on March 30, issued a statement saying: "Collective security organizations like NATO have grown up because there is no confidence that all the members of the United Nations will observe their covenants."

Although professing opposition to the admission of Red China on high moral grounds, Dulles does not recoil from fraternizing in the UN with the Kremlinites. In his book *War or Peace,* he states that the UN is a place of "genuine fellowship", that this fellowship is "shared to some extent" by the Communist delegates, and that he has had "intimate and enlightening talks with them".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What are the moral implications of fellowship in a pretended peace organization with atheistic Communists, who are dedicated to our destruction? Perhaps the best comment on that question was made by the Apostle Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?"

DULLES HAS STUDIED the works of Lenin and Stalin, and he knows that they rejected the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the non-Communist world. In the April issue of *Foreign Affairs,* he expounds the Soviet strategy of conquest, which seeks to force the non-Communist countries to extend themselves, as Lenin put it, "beyond their strength". Then, said Lenin, "our victory is assured." Then, said Stalin, "will be the moment for the decisive blow." Yet Dulles opposes expulsion of the Communists from the UN, which they use only to advance their plans for the amalgamation of all the world into what Stalin called "a single state union".

Dulles' moral revulsion against Communist China might seem more genuine if he had not written in *War or Peace,* published in 1950, that all nations should be members of the UN without distinction as to those which are "good" and those which are "bad". The only test that he asked the Peiping regime to meet was proof of "its ability to govern China".

Lodge has said he would not hesitate to use the veto in the Security Council if that should be necessary to exclude Red China. In the General Assembly, where there is no veto and the United States has only one vote, UN parliamentarians are prepared to rule that only a simple majority is required to settle a credentials dispute between Communist and Nationalist Chinese delegates. The United States exerted its influence to the utmost to exclude India, a veritable satellite of Red China, from the proposed Korean conference, but was defeated in the Political Committee by a vote of 27 to 21. India was excluded only because a two-thirds majority was required in the Assembly itself. It is inconceivable that the Chinese Communists, once admitted to the General Assembly, could or would be excluded from other UN organs, including the Security Council. Even in the unlikely eventuality of an attempt by the United States to use the veto, the Council could determine, by a majority vote, that it was a procedural question, not subject to the veto.

LODGE'S BRASH TALK about keeping Red China out of the UN warrants no more confidence than his loud assurances, a little over a year ago, that the Eisenhower Administration would eliminate all American Communists from the UN Secretariat. The Administration's UN loyalty program is a self-evident fraud. Of the 1,744 American Secretariat members investigated only one, a woman clerk, has been fired and she refused to fill out a loyalty questionnaire. Although a few others are still under investigation, not a single adverse report has been submitted to the UN thus far. A division director, who received

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an adverse loyalty report from the Acheson State Department in 1952, has been cleared by the Eisenhower Administration's International Organizations Loyalty Board. Proteges of Alger Hiss still occupy strategic positions in the UN.

Apparently anticipating a whitewash, Lodge has appropriated Eleanor Roosevelt's witless argument that Communists in the UN are not a security problem since there are no secrets there for them to steal. He pretends that American "security" cannot be harmed by policy subversion, by Communist propaganda in UN reports, and by Communist agents accompanying UN missions to all parts of the world.

The failure of the Soviet Union to fill its quota of UN employees has been cited for years by Mrs. Roosevelt and recently by Lodge as if it were irrefutable proof that the UN is not a fruitful field for spies. There are only 29 Russians on the UN staff, although the Soviet quota ranges from 116 to 155. Unlike other countries, however, the Russians are rotated every two or three years and, therefore, are constantly coming and going. Moreover, they function as spy masters, not ordinary spies. American Communists and those from other countries are subject to their discipline. Valentin Gubitchev, a Soviet military intelligence officer employed by the UN in the guise of an engineer, was arrested with Judith Coplon for stealing secrets from the Justice Department, not from the UN. Nicolai Skvortsov, formerly the second highest ranking Russian at the UN, was barred from reentry into this country on a charge of trying to organize a spy ring.

There is only one way to solve the UN problem and that is to abolish it. If the United States should withdraw from the UN it would quickly collapse. Some Republicans in Congress have warned that the United States will pull out if Red China is admitted. If this were certain, patriotic Americans should favor Red China's admission; but it would be rash to trust a Congress which is still addicted to Trumanism in foreign affairs.

Politicians are loath to confess that in supporting the UN, they betrayed their country's interests. As recently as December 8, President Eisenhower told the UN that the United States would remain steadfast in its support of the organization "in the conviction that you will provide a great share of the wisdom, of the courage and the faith which can bring to this world lasting peace for all nations, and happiness and well-being for all men". It was clear that Eisenhower had learned nothing about world affairs since November 16, 1945, when the London Conference of Foreign Ministers had broken up in complete failure, when the international prospect was not peace but cold war, and when he told the House Military Affairs Committee: "Nothing guides Russian policy so much as a desire for friendship with the United States."

The UN is a heritage of the "bipartisan foreign policy" betrayal, and those who now control the Republican party are stuck with a stillborn albatross.

Chesly Manly is the *Chicago Tribune* correspondent accredited to UN, and is the author of *The Twenty-Year Revolution—From Roosevelt to Eisenhower.* Henry Regnery Company. Reviewed in our issue of March 3.

Additional Copies 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume XI, No. 16 Wednesday, April 21, 1954 Washington, D. C.

Indo-China: Behind the hugger-mugger of Nixon's words and Dulles' travels, Washington in the last forty-eight hours has been going through a storm of fear and speculation besides which even the McCarthy affair seems like a squall in a teacup.

Washington — and, it is presumed, the country as well — isn't afraid of war as such. There is no pacifism in Congress — not even among the New Deal Democrats who now grow eloquent (with a smirk at the GOP discomfiture about "war mongering"). The Congress and people, observers believe, would actually welcome a war with Soviet Russia if they thought we could fight it directly and get it over with. What Washington and the constituents it represents fear is "another Korea," this time in the jungles of Indo-China. ("Why couldn't the State Department have chosen a temperate zone for a change?", is one current wisecrack.)

For Washington includes a large body of military men who are muzzled publicly, but they patriotically like to talk to such as HUMAN EVENTS and members of Congress. They say that Dulles, aided by Nixon, is headed for a fruitless quagmire. Unless France unexpectedly grants Indo-China independence and a strong native anti-Communist movement can be formed, dispatch of American troops into that area would be useless.

These observers ridicule Ike's recent speech in which he compared the Southeastern Asian situation to a row of dominoes. Ike claimed that if the Indo-China domino fell it would bring down the other dominoes. No doubt. But what old intelligence hands here remark is that shoring up that one domino won't prevent the others from falling flat. They point out that the others — Burma, India and Indonesia — are none too reliable as it is. Burma has practically gone over to the Communists now; India is virtually a Soviet satellite; the latest Indonesian government is classed as pro-Soviet, and contentedly lets war materials go to Red China. How long Malaya and Thailand can hold out is a matter of much conjecture.

Under no circumstances, say these military, should the U.S. send ground forces into Indo-China. Should ideal political conditions arise — that is, emergence of a free, fighting Indo-China — then all help could be feasibly given in accord with our now official "air-sea" strategy. But another Korea would not be worth it, even if all Southern Asia went to the Kremlin. Rubber and tin? We got along on our own synthetic rubber for five years; there's a stockpile of tin for many years on hand. Fall of Southern Asia would not be healthy; but on balance we would be better off if we avoided another Korea.

Note Sen. Jenner's impassioned speech in the Senate, April 20, calling on the release of Free Asia forces to save Indo-China and denouncing the "Acheson Fifth Column" in the State Department.

Housing Scandal: Behind the uproar over the revelations about astronomic profits in Government guaranteed housing, there's a so far unreported angle (apart from the general question — seldom voiced — why any housing at all should be guaranteed). The story we hear from various reliable sources concerns bureaucratic ambition, pure and simple.

A plan for reorganization of the Federal Housing Administration, it seems, has been brewing for some time and has had the enthusiastic support of Mr. Albert Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Guy T. O. Hollyday, Commissioner of FHA, opposed it claiming that it would destroy the independence of his department which handles the insurance of mortgages. Bureaucratic Jealousy? Maybe. Mr. Hollyday hasn't yet cleared himself of charges that he remained in office a

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year without doing much to end the scandal of the huge profits reaped by builders at the expense of the taxpayer. Anyway, he had a point when he argued that the insurance business should be run, not as a political instrument, but on sound financial principles.

Mr. Cole, no shrinking violet himself, brought the controversy to the attention of Sherman Adams, Presidential Assistant and the leader of the GOP New Dealers who think they know a thing or two about creating and maintaining a bureaucracy of their own. Adams got Ike to put his signature to an order for the unceremonious ousting of Mr. Hollyday (as lushly reported in the press). And he thereby strengthened Cole's position as the looming czar of Federal Housing. Cole, it is said, would like to emulate Democratic New Dealer Wilson Wyatt who held court over Housing himself *sub regno Trumani*. Time for a change?

McCarthy: *The Progressive*, a left-wing publication has devoted a whole issue to Senator McCarthy and put a fancy price on it of seventy-five cents a copy on newsstands. It ballyhoos the efforts of the "Wisconsin Citizen's Committee" which during 1952 when McCarthy was running for re-election claims to have found out the truth about the stormy Wisconsin petrel. A careful reading of the *Progressive* reveals that the material submitted is old hat. The important question, however, is who is behind the *Progressive* in financing this expensive issue. On April 9, Fulton Lewis said over the air that the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) was helping the printing and distribution of the brochure by cash and other financial assistance.

The report of the Wisconsin Citizens' Committee which the *Progressive* says it has brought up to date is obviously distorted, but the ADA as the financial angel for propagating such obvious smear tactics against McCarthy brands the whole enterprise a deep pink indeed. In the May issue of the *American Mercury*, John T. Flynn labels the ADA as the socialist Politburo — the planning body of the socialist movement in the United States. The ADA has called loudly and long for recognition of Red China and its admission to UN. It has demanded abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and has made severe attacks on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. It has parroted the Commie line that the Bill of Rights is being destroyed by Congressional committees which ferret out Reds and, like the *Daily Worker*, it has been unsparing in its abuse of Senator McCarthy.

The astonishing thing is that reputable anti-Communists are actually recommending that the *Progressive's* issue on McCarthy be read to get the other side of the McCarthy controversy. We believe there are two tests to be applied to any critical report on McCarthy which claims to be objective and fair. (1) Does it admit the tremendous services of the Senator in arousing the people to the issue of Red infiltration of the nation, and give him credit for exposing and driving out of government so many agents or stooges of the Kremlin? Back in 1950 the Communists enjoyed comparative safety in their entrenched position. Truman had virtually silenced the House Un-American Activities Committee and the FBI was under wraps. At this critical point, it was McCarthy who launched his assault, put the Communist issue on page one of the papers, and began his drive to expose the concealed Reds or their sympathizers. Of the nine persons named by McCarthy before the Tydings ("whitewash") Committee *seven* have been driven out of the Government, one faces a four count perjury indictment (Lattimore) and the other (John Paton Davies) has been recommended by a Senate Committee to the Department of Justice for a perjury indictment. (2) Does it admit the existence of a dangerous Red conspiracy in the U.S.? In the *Progressive's* report on McCarthy no credit whatsoever is given the man and there is no admission that Red infiltration is a menace. Instead, it prattles about improving social conditions as the big buffer to world Communism which is exactly the ADA technique for spreading socialism.

Labor Law: The Administration's proposals to amend the Taft-Hartley Law are having rough sledding on Capitol Hill. We are told that the Administration has insisted on meddling so much with the operations of the Labor Committees of both the Senate and House that, on the House side at least, there looms much sentiment for not doing anything at all this session about Taft-Hartley amendments.

But out of the bickerings an almost unbelievable story of White House politics is emerging. During the campaign of 1952 the big labor bosses were practically unanimous in their opposition to Eisenhower

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

— and pulled all the strings at their command to drive the labor vote into the Stevenson camp. But there were some big labor bosses who individually came out for, or were friendly to Ike and the story is that Ike has not forgotten them in his program to amend the Taft-Hartley Law. The few big labor bosses who spoke out for Eisenhower were in the building trades, the maritime unions and the amusement industry. Our sources report that Petrillo, boss of the musicians, was probably friendly and cooperative with Ike and Earl Warren.

Our sources say that accordingly the Administration has demanded that existing restrictions of Taft-Hartley on the secondary boycott be relaxed with respect to the building trades, maritime unions and the amusement industry. The secondary boycott was a powerful weapon under the Wagner Act for the labor bosses to coerce employers and it was for that reason that the late Senator Taft insisted that it be outlawed as an unfair labor practice. Secondary boycotts multiply the number of unions an employer has to fight and, where allowed, practically assure his capitulation.

In the Senate bill as now reported the restrictions of Taft-Hartley on secondary boycotts are relaxed for the construction and maritime unions. On the House side the Labor Committee has so far relaxed them for the construction unions — but under reported severe prodding from the White House — is preparing to relax them for maritime and amusement unions.

The building trades have long been noted for graft and racketeering; the maritime unions have had the public holding its nose for months; and amusement unions have likewise a long and ruthless record of predatory activities. Petrillo's union is one of the most despotic "to hell with the public" unions on record. In brief, observers say, it would be hard to find three worse fields of unionism — and to relax restrictions on the secondary boycott in them is nothing less than a tragic betrayal of the public interest.

Not Merely Gossip: One wry witticism made by former President Herbert Hoover in his speech (April 24) to the American Society of Newspaper Editors evoked much amusement among the scribes. Mr. Hoover, speaking of the "handout" pressure groups which have helped to scuttle economy and create unbalanced budgets, remarked that there are other counter-pressure groups which seek to reduce Government expenditures. "There are," said Hoover, "only two of these organizations in addition to Senator Byrd." It is well-known here that the former President holds the Virginia Democratic Senator in affectionate and high esteem and the editors liked the notion that Byrd virtually constitutes a "pressure group" for economy all by himself. It is rumored that the two organizations to which Hoover referred were The Tax Foundation and The National Committee on the Hoover Report.

● Dulles suffers the handicap of trying to shape policy while his own office is filled with Acheson holdovers. An example is cited by those in the know in the State Department who have often warned Dulles to clean out his own entourage. The example involves Dulles' speech to the Latin-American gathering at Caracas a month ago. A speech for Dulles was drafted and the man chosen for the job was none other than George Kennan, who started the "containment" policy favored by Acheson. Kennan has been doing various jobs for the Department since his resignation as a high official a year ago. Our sources say that the speech fell short of being an all-out anti-Communist speech and Dulles had to alter it for the stronger before he delivered it in Caracas. It is understood now that Kennan will not be invited to perform such a task again. (This situation helps to explain the Indo-China policy of Dulles: Acheson prefers small wars like Korea and Indo-China, not "mass retaliation.")

Tears For The Forgotten: The most affecting story of the week, as we see it, was the gathering of the newly formed "Kin of America's Forgotten Men," an organization which gathered together in New York seventy-two women who have sons or husbands "missing in Korea." They appeared — futile gesture — before the offices of top UN officials in New York to plead that the UN force the Communists to release their loved ones. The UN officials, of course, refused to see them. Then they appealed to President Eisenhower to spearhead a bid to demand return of the GIs before any UN nations confer with the Reds, who hold their kin captive, in Geneva. In Washington, the failure of the Administration to force return of some 800 Americans still in the hands of Red China amounts to a scandal. Americans here remain silent with shame when foreigners express amazement that this step has not been taken.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Radio Front: Many of our subscribers write us saying they are enthusiastic listeners every Sunday to John T. Flynn, author of *The Roosevelt Myth*, *The Road Ahead* and *The Lattimore Story*. Other subscribers, aware that he broadcasts, inquire as to what stations carry his program. Flynn's talks are sponsored by America's Future, Inc., a non-profit educational foundation (Robert Lund, President and a board of trustees including Lamar Fleming, Jr., Mrs. Amos Pinchot, General Robert E. Wood, etc.). The program is broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System and affiliated stations in 28 states. In New York, Mr. Flynn is heard on WOR at 12:00 noon Sundays; in Chicago on WGN at 5:45 PM., Sundays. Inquiries to Mr. Randolph K. Scott, Executive Director, America's Future, Inc., 210 W. 43d St., New York 17, N. Y., will bring information as to other stations carrying the Flynn program.

Americans Under Foreign Command: President Eisenhower's statement promising our European "Allies" that the U.S. would maintain forces indefinitely in Europe has aroused some popular resentment. But it may run into even stronger opposition from the people when they understand the implication of another promise made in the same statement. The able Foreign Editor of the Washington *Star*, Constantine Brown, noted on April 17, that Ike will encourage "the closest possible integration" between EDC forces on the one hand and the U.S. and NATO forces on the other.

The EDC (European Defense Community) is the projected European army which Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium have ratified. France and Italy have not yet given parliamentary okay to it. It is planned as an international army, amalgamated as Brown explains "into one single force and drawing the same pay." NATO forces are under U.S. command, but under EDC, as Brown points out, "a German unit may have a French or Italian general at its head and a Netherlands unit may have a Belgian commander."

Hence, this promise Brown remarks "has caused eyebrows to be raised in Congress" and "the question which causes such uneasiness among Republicans and Democrats now is whether the Commander-in-Chief has the right to order an 'integration' of the American forces with those of the prospective EDC without Congressional approval."

Brown does not go into all the implications. But here in Washington, it is obvious that a measure to put American boys under, say, an Italian commander would scarcely inspire popular enthusiasm. It would represent another attempt to submerge our national rights and sovereignty under not only an international organization but also under direct command of another national. Members of Congress already have their hands full answering protests from constituents about the Status of Forces Treaty. As a result of this measure, American boys abroad have been put in French jails after trial by French courts, for long sentences. (Constantine Brown's column appears daily in the Washington *Star* and is widely syndicated throughout the newspapers of the country by Columbia Features, 36 West 44th St., New York, N. Y.)

Book Front: *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor* by Rear Admiral Robert A. Theobald, U.S.N., Rtd. New York: Devin-Adair Co. $3.50. Reviewed by Frank Chodorov.

Ever so often some investigator comes up with a bit of truth that blemishes the shining armor in which the myth of Franklin D. Roosevelt is encased. To be sure, the idolators of the four-time President apply their "spit and polish" to the affected part of the coat of mail; that is, they write a book proving that the researcher is a liar or, at least, a reactionary. But, nothing they can do can restore any glitter to the spot that has gone rusty from exposure: the spot that might be called "Mr. Roosevelt's Infamy of Pearl Harbor."

Morgenstern, Flynn, Sanborn, Tansill have proven beyond all doubt that the incident of December 7, 1941 — which cost us over 3,000 lives, to say nothing of a fleet — can be traced to at least stupidity in the White House. The documents they unearthed point directly to the fact that Roosevelt, who was committed to the involvement of this country in war, was anxious for some such incident, for without it Congress could not have been induced to declare war; the country was too peace-minded. He kept prodding, insulting and humiliating the Japanese to the point where national hara-kiri was the only course left to them.

However, while some of these historians intimated that although Mr. Roosevelt knew the Japanese were planning an attack, he was probably not aware of the chosen target. It remained for an admiral of the Navy, one trained in interpreting the jargon of coded military messages, to remove doubt on this point. In his book, *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*, Admiral Theobald makes clear that General Marshall and Admiral Stark, the highest ranking officers in the service, also knew that Pearl Harbor would be attacked, and charges that in denying such knowledge at the rigged-up Congressional hearings, they were simply protecting their Commander-in-Chief. The two officers at Pearl Harbor, Admiral Kimmel and General Short, were denied all knowledge of the imminence of the attack, so that they could be made to shoulder the blame of Mr. Roosevelt's infamous plan.

This last exposure of the Pearl Harbor plot consists mainly of a cold analysis of official dispatches. There is no attempt at literary brilliance. That makes the story all the more frightening. The conclusion that springs to the reader's mind when he closes the book is this: "Can it be that the President of the United States, for reasons of state, actually sealed the doom of 3,000 American boys?" Technically, that would not constitute murder. But, morally?

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED